

REMARKS

Claims 1-43 are pending. Claims 1, 6, 8, 15, 20, 23, 28, 30, 35 and 37 are amended herein. No new matter is added as a result of the claim amendments.

Applicants respectfully note that the Examiner indicates that Claims 10, 18 and 40 are rejected but did not provide a basis for rejecting those claims in the instant Office Action.

102 Rejections

Claims 1, 4-8, 12-15, 19-23, 26-30, 33-37 and 41-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Wistendahl et al. ("Wistendahl;" U.S. Patent No. 6,496,981). The Applicants have reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submit that the present invention as recited in Claims 1, 4-8, 12-15, 19-23, 26-30, 33-37 and 41-43 is not shown or suggested by Wistendahl.

Independent Claim 1 recites that an embodiment of the present invention is directed to a method comprising "storing said one or more URLs separately from said program content, wherein said one or more URLs are retrievable independent of said program content; wherein said program content is displayed on said television and Web-based information identified by said one or more URLs is concurrently displayed on a device other than said television." Claims 4-7 are dependent on Claim 1 and recite additional limitations.

Applicants respectfully submit that Wistendahl does not show or suggest the limitations cited in independent Claim 1. Applicants respectfully note that the mechanism described by Wistendahl for retrieving further information about

original media content requires a user to point to (e.g., click on or highlight) a "hot spot" in the original media content as the original media content is displayed. If the user wants to access the further information at a later time, the mechanism described by Wistendahl requires that the original media content be retrieved so that the hot spot in the original media content can be pointed to. The Examiner is respectfully directed to column 9, lines 28-46, for example.

Thus, according to Wistendahl, the program content and the pointer to further information are inextricably associated with each other. In contrast, according to the embodiment of the present invention recited in independent Claim 1, the URLs are stored separately from the program content, and the URLs can be retrieved independent of the program content. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Wistendahl does not show or suggest "storing said one or more URLs separately from said program content, wherein said one or more URLs are retrievable independent of said program content" as recited by independent Claim 1.

In addition, Applicants respectfully submit that Wistendahl does not show or suggest the Claim 1 limitation "wherein said program content is displayed on said television and Web-based information identified by said one or more URLs is concurrently displayed on a device other than said television" (emphasis added). Although Wistendahl (in column 7, lines 35-41) recites that a subscriber's terminal is typically a set-top box but can also be a computer or other type of terminal, both the media content and the further information about the media content are displayed on the same device (see column 9, lines 29-33, of Wistendahl, for example). Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Wistendahl does not show

or suggest a television and a device other than a television "wherein said program content is displayed on said television and Web-based information identified by said one or more URLs is concurrently displayed on a device other than said television" as recited by independent Claim 1.

Independent Claim 8 recites that an embodiment of the present invention is directed to a method comprising "storing said one or more URLs at said second device separately from said program content such that said one or more URLs are retrievable without accessing said program content, wherein said identifying, communicating and storing are performed automatically without user intervention; wherein said program content is displayed on said television and Web-based information associated with said set of URLs is concurrently displayed on a device other than said television." Claims 12-14 are dependent on Claim 8 and recite additional limitations.

By reasoning similar to that presented above, Applicants respectfully submit that Wistendahl does not show or suggest "storing said one or more URLs at said second device separately from said program content such that said one or more URLs are retrievable without accessing said program content" and also does not show or suggest "wherein said program content is displayed on said television and Web-based information associated with said set of URLs is concurrently displayed on a device other than said television" as recited in independent Claim 8.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that Wistendahl does not show or suggest a method "wherein said identifying, communicating and storing are performed automatically without user intervention" as recited in independent

Claim 8. According to Wistendahl, a user must click on an object in a scene and click on a displayed save button in order to store a particular scene location so that further information about the scene can be subsequently reviewed (reference is made to column 9, lines 45-55, of Wistendahl, for example). In contrast, according to the present claimed invention, URLs are stored automatically without user intervention.

Independent Claim 15 recites that an embodiment of the present invention is directed to a method comprising "storing and retrieving said one or more URLs independent from said program content; ... receiving Web-based information identified by said one or more URLs, wherein said one or more URLs are accessed independent from said program content; and ... displaying said Web-based information on a device other than said television; wherein said program content is concurrently displayed on said television." Claims 19-22 are dependent on Claim 15 and recite additional limitations. By reasoning similar to that presented above, Applicants respectfully submit that Wistendahl does not show or suggest the Claim 15 limitations cited above.

Independent Claim 23 recites that an embodiment of the present invention is directed to a system that executes a method comprising "storing said one or more URLs separately from said program content, wherein said one or more URLs are retrievable independent of said program content; wherein said program content is displayed on said television and Web-based information identified by said one or more URLs is concurrently displayed on a device other than said television." Claims 26-29 are dependent on Claim 23 and recite additional limitations. By

reasoning similar to that presented above, Applicants respectfully submit that Wistendahl does not show or suggest the Claim 23 limitations cited above.

Independent Claim 30 recites that an embodiment of the present invention is directed to a computer-usable medium that causes a computer system to execute a method comprising "storing said one or more URLs separately from said program content, wherein said one or more URLs are retrievable independent of said program content; wherein said program content is displayed on said television and Web-based information identified by said one or more URLs is concurrently displayed on a device other than said television." Claims 33-36 are dependent on Claim 30 and recite additional limitations. By reasoning similar to that presented above, Applicants respectfully submit that Wistendahl does not show or suggest the Claim 30 limitations cited above.

Independent Claim 37 recites that an embodiment of the present invention is directed to a set top box comprising "means for storing said one or more URLs separately from said program content, wherein said one or more URLs are retrievable independent of said program content; wherein said program content is displayed on said television and Web-based information identified by said one or more URLs is concurrently displayed on a device other than said television." Claims 41-43 are dependent on Claim 37 and recite additional limitations. By reasoning similar to that presented above, Applicants respectfully submit that Wistendahl does not show or suggest the Claim 37 limitations cited above.

In summary, Applicants respectfully submit that Wistendahl does not show or suggest the present claimed invention as recited by independent Claims 1, 8, 15,

23, 30 and 37, and that these claims are in condition for allowance. Also, Applicants respectfully submit that Wistendahl does not show or suggest the additional claimed features of the present invention as recited in Claims 4-7 dependent on Claim 1, Claims 12-14 dependent on Claim 8, Claims 19-22 dependent on Claim 15, Claims 26-29 dependent on Claim 23, Claims 33-36 dependent on Claim 30, and Claims 41-43 dependent on Claim 37, and that these claims are in condition for allowance as being dependent on allowable base claims. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection of Claims 1, 4-8, 12-15, 19-23, 26-30, 33-37 and 41-43 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is traversed.

103 Rejections

Claims 2, 3, 9, 11, 16, 17, 24, 25, 31, 32, 38 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wistendahl in view of Moraes (U.S. Patent No. 6,014,502). The Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the present invention as recited in Claims 2, 3, 9, 11, 16, 17, 24, 25, 31, 32, 38 and 39 is not shown or suggested by Wistendahl and Moraes, alone or in combination.

Claims 2 and 3 are dependent on independent Claim 1; Claims 9 and 11 are dependent on independent Claim 8; Claims 16 and 17 are dependent on independent Claim 15; Claims 24 and 25 are dependent on independent Claim 23; Claims 31 and 32 are dependent on independent Claim 30; and Claims 38 and 39 are dependent on independent Claim 37. As presented above, Applicants respectfully submit that Wistendahl does not show or suggest the present claimed invention as recited by independent Claims 1, 8, 15, 23, 30 and 37.

Applicants further submit that Moraes does not overcome the shortcomings of Wistendahl. Specifically, Applicants respectfully submit that Moraes, alone or in combination with Wistendahl, does not show or suggest a method comprising "storing said one or more URLs separately from said program content, wherein said one or more URLs are retrievable independent of said program content; wherein said program content is displayed on said television and Web-based information identified by said one or more URLs is concurrently displayed on a device other than said television" as recited in independent Claim 1.

Applicants also respectfully submit that Moraes, alone or in combination with Wistendahl, does not show or suggest a method comprising "storing said one or more URLs at said second device separately from said program content such that said one or more URLs are retrievable without accessing said program content, wherein said identifying, communicating and storing are performed automatically without user intervention; wherein said program content is displayed on said television and Web-based information associated with said set of URLs is concurrently displayed on a device other than said television" as recited in independent Claim 8.

Applicants also respectfully submit that Moraes, alone or in combination with Wistendahl, does not show or suggest a method comprising "storing and retrieving said one or more URLs independent from said program content; ... receiving Web-based information identified by said one or more URLs, wherein said one or more URLs are accessed independent from said program content; and ... displaying said Web-based information on a device other than said television; wherein said program

content is concurrently displayed on said television" as recited in independent Claim 15.

Applicants also respectfully submit that Moraes, alone or in combination with Wistendahl, does not show or suggest a method comprising "storing said one or more URLs separately from said program content, wherein said one or more URLs are retrievable independent of said program content; wherein said program content is displayed on said television and Web-based information identified by said one or more URLs is concurrently displayed on a device other than said television" as recited in independent Claim 23.

Applicants also respectfully submit that Moraes, alone or in combination with Wistendahl, does not show or suggest a computer-usable medium that causes a computer system to execute a method comprising "storing said one or more URLs separately from said program content, wherein said one or more URLs are retrievable independent of said program content; wherein said program content is displayed on said television and Web-based information identified by said one or more URLs is concurrently displayed on a device other than said television" as recited in independent Claim 30.

Applicants also respectfully submit that Moraes, alone or in combination with Wistendahl, does not show or suggest a set top box comprising "means for storing said one or more URLs separately from said program content, wherein said one or more URLs are retrievable independent of said program content; wherein said program content is displayed on said television and Web-based information

identified by said one or more URLs is concurrently displayed on a device other than said television" as recited in independent Claim 37.

In summary, Applicants respectfully submit that Wistendahl and Moraes, alone or combination, do not show or suggest the present claimed invention as recited by independent Claims 1, 8, 15, 23, 30 and 37, and that these claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Wistendahl and Moraes, alone or combination, do not show or suggest the additional claimed features of the present invention as recited in Claims 2-3 dependent on Claim 1, Claims 9 and 11 dependent on Claim 8, Claims 16-17 dependent on Claim 15, Claims 24-25 dependent on Claim 23, Claims 31-32 dependent on Claim 30, and Claims 38-39 dependent on Claim 37, and that these claims are in condition for allowance as being dependent on allowable base claims. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection of Claims 2, 3, 9, 11, 16, 17, 24, 25, 31, 32, 38 and 39 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above remarks, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejected claims.

Based on the arguments presented above, the Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 1-43 overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, the Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of these claims.

The Applicants have reviewed the reference cited but not relied upon. The Applicants did not find this reference to show or suggest the present claimed invention: U.S. 6,131,162.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Date: 9/19/03



William A. Zarbis

Reg. No. 46,120

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, California 95113
(408) 938-9060